

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 were submitted for examination. In this Office Action, Claim 1-4, 6-7, 9-12 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertazzi et al (US Patent No.: 6,370,560, hereinafter "Robertazzi"), and Claims 5, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertazzi in view of Ellis (US Patent No.: 6,725,250, hereinafter "Ellis").

The Examiner is appreciated for the thoughtful examination and comments in the Office Action. In the foregoing amendments, the Title has been amended to be more closely pertaining to the claims, the drawings have been corrected to remove some informalities in the reference numbers, and the Specification has also been amended to correct some noticed informalities. Because of a fairly large number of corrections in the Specification, the amendments to the Specification have been made directly in the originally filed Specification, a corresponding clean version thereof is enclosed herewith. The Applicant respectfully submits that no new matters have been introduced in the amendments.

In responding to the objections by the Examiner to claims 12-13, 18, 26 and 27, the Applicant does not notice any informalities in dependency. Claims 5-11 all depend upon claim 4 that depends upon claim 3 while claim 3 itself depends on claim 1. Because claim 2 is also dependent on claim 1, claims 12-13 respectively depending on claim 1 are believed to be proper. The same is applicable to claims 18 and 26-27. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner for more specifics of the informalities in the next office action.

In addition to correcting some informalities, all claims have been amended to further distinguish from Robertazzi and Ellis. No new matters have been introduced in the amendments of the claims. For the convenience of the Examiner, a clean version of the claims is proved as an appendix to this Response.

As amended, Claim 1 now recites:

a plurality of independent computing devices coupled to a network, wherein each of the computing devices is provided with a variety of computing resources;

a coordination computing device configured to coordinate bartering of various computing resources respectively running in the computing devices, wherein each of the computing devices is configured to barter the various computing resources with the coordination computing device that is executing a negotiation process requiring human intervention to subsequently reach a bartering contract with some of the computing devices; and

wherein a fraction of the computing resources of each of some of the computing devices is coordinated through coordination computing device and to simultaneously communicate and functionally operate with each other through the network to perform an application.

*(emphasis added)*

As supported in paragraph (042), the coordination computing device is executing a negotiation process that requires human intervention to subsequently reach a bartering contract with some of the computing devices.

In contrast, Robertazzi relies on a controller 103 of FIG. 1A and 1B that is programmed to automatically determine what processor platforms 801 shown in FIG. 8 to be selected for distributed process. As clearly illustrated in FIG. 2A, FIG. 2B and FIG. 2C, (further described from line 40 of Col. 7 to line 22 of Col. 10), in reference to the data collected from each distributed processor platform, a collection of processor platforms are automatically determined in terms of cost without compromising the time required to accomplish a distributed task. Robertazzi neither teaches nor suggests that a negotiation process is executed in a coordination computing device (i.e., a controller) requiring human intervention to subsequently reach a bartering contract with some of the processor platforms.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the once-amended Claim 1 is allowable over Robertazzi. Reconsideration of Claims 1-13 is kindly requested.

Claim 14 is also amended to distinctly distinguish from Robertazzi and Ellis, viewed alone or in combination. In particular, Claim 14 recites:

... each of the computing devices preinstalled with a DCRBS software module;

a coordination computing device preinstalled with a DCRBS coordinator software module that is configured to coordinate bartering of various computing resources respectively running in the computing devices, the DCRBS coordinator software module determining a set of candidates from the computing devices in reference to collected parameters pertaining to each of the candidates, wherein the coordination computing device is further executing a negotiation process to subsequently reach a bartering contract with some of the candidates;...

*(emphasis added)*

In addition to the above arguments, Robertazzi is silent on preinstalled software module running on the individual computing devices and a coordination computing device. Robertazzi determines a set of candidates to execute a distributed task based on cost analysis that is only executed on the controller that makes decision to determine the candidates within the required time constraints (see FIG. 2A). Claim 14 herein recites that the coordination computing device is executing a negotiation process to subsequently reach a bartering contract with some of the candidates. As the name suggests, a “negotiation process” must be bilaterally and involve some interactions between the coordination computing device and an individual computing device. That is where the preinstalled software module is configured to do. Clearly, neither Robertazzi nor Ellis has taught or suggested such combined features including preinstalled software module in individual computing devices and such a negotiation process. The Applicant believes that Claim 14 shall be allowable over Robertazzi nor Ellis, viewed alone or in combination.

Claims 15 – 27 are method claims. The Applicant wishes to use the above arguments to support the once-amended Claims 15 – 27, and respectfully submits that neither Robertazzi nor Ellis has taught or suggested such combined features recited in Claims 15 – 27.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that Claims 1 – 27 shall be in condition for allowance over the cited references. Early and favorable action is being respectfully solicited.


If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplementary Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at (408)777-8873.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to " No-Fee Amendments , Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450", 08/19/2005.

Name: Joe Zheng

Signature: 

Respectfully submitted;

  
Joe Zheng  
Reg. No.: 39,345

## **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

FIGs. 1-8 have been amended. A replacement sheet for each of the amended drawings is enclosed with the change(s) in circle. A set of formal drawings will be submitted should the application is allowed.